

# **BAROSSA AND LIGHT REGION LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT STUDY**

**Report for Planning SA, the Barossa Council, the Light Regional  
Council, and the Barossa Light Regional Development Board**



**Dr Andrew Lothian  
Scenic Solutions  
2005**



# **BAROSSA AND LIGHT REGION LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT STUDY**

**Report for Planning SA, the Barossa Council, the Light Regional Council,  
and the Barossa Light Regional Development Board**



**Dr Andrew Lothian  
Scenic Solutions**

**PO Box 3158 Unley  
South Australia, 5061**

**2005**

#### GENERAL DISCLAIMER

You accept all risks and responsibility for losses, damages, costs and other consequences resulting directly or indirectly from use of this report and any information or material it contains.

To the maximum extent permitted by law, Scenic Solutions excludes all liability to any person arising directly or indirectly from use of this report and any information or material it contains

#### NOTES ON USE OF THE SCENIC QUALITY MAP

1. The information contained in the map was derived from limited field inspection and is subject to change without notice.
2. Boundaries between mapping units should be treated as transition zones.
3. The map is intended to provide a regional overview and should not be used to draw conclusions about conditions at specific locations.
4. Advice from Scenic Solutions should be sought prior to using this information for commercial decision making.
5. Under no circumstances may the data or information associated with this map or any accompanying report be altered in any way without the express permission of Scenic Solutions.

© Dr Andrew Lothian  
Principal  
Scenic Solutions

ABN 55 275 407 146

Address: Scenic Solutions, PO Box 3158, Unley, South Australia, 5061  
Email: [lothian.andrew@gmail.com](mailto:lothian.andrew@gmail.com)  
Mobile: 0439 872 226  
Internet: [www.scenicsolutions.com.au](http://www.scenicsolutions.com.au)

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project aimed to assess the scenic quality of the Barossa Valley region rural landscapes outside of towns. It was commissioned by Planning SA, the Barossa Council, the Light Regional Council, and the Barossa Light Regional Development Board. The project was undertaken between May and September 2005.

The approach to the task involved classifying the region into units of similar characteristics, for these to be photographed and rated by participants, and for the ratings to be applied to areas of the region with similar characteristics for mapping purposes.

The region comprised the Barossa Valley between Freeling, Lyndoch and Truro, together with the high land through Collingrove and the Eden Valley from Truro south to Springton and Williamstown. The survey instrument comprised 120 scenes of the region, selected from a total of 1700 photographs, together with 30 scenes from elsewhere in South Australia to ensure State-based ratings. The survey was placed on the Internet and invitations were sent to organisations and individuals to participate. Scenes were rated on a 1 – 10 (low – high) scale. The analysis was based on 1210 ratings which provided an excellent confidence interval of +/- 2.8%.

Naturalness, trees and terrain were found to have the strongest influence on ratings; the presence of water and the visibility of the Barossa Ranges had lesser influence. The presence of vines had a negative influence on ratings due to their generally barren appearance without trees. Churches and ruins in the region attracted higher ratings than farm sheds and winery buildings. Roads with indigenous roadside vegetation rated among the highest scenes.

Landscape factors such as trees, vines and naturalness were scored and these scores were combined with the ratings to develop predictive models for the entire region as well as for smaller landscape units within the region. These models indicated for a given area which combination of landscape factors would produce the ratings obtained.

Based on the ratings and models, the region's landscape quality was mapped. Overall the northern and western areas were low rating, 5 – 5.25, while the eastern area (Collingrove - Eden Valley) was higher 5.50 – 5.75. The core viticulture areas generally had moderate ratings, 5.50. The higher rated Barossa Ranges which overlooks the area rated from 5.50 to 6.50.

Micro ratings were derived for heritage buildings (6.0), areas of native vegetation (6.25), roads with indigenous vegetation (6.5), streams with trees (6.5) and eyesores such as quarries and car dumps (4.0).

Twelve recommendations were made relating to the planning, development and management of the Barossa Study Region:



---

**CONTENTS**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
	1.1 Project background	1
	1.2 Project brief	1
	1.3 Project methodology	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS</b>	
	2.1 Australian studies of scenic quality	6
	2.2 Affective basis of aesthetic preferences	14
	2.3 Theories of landscape aesthetics	15
	2.4 Influence of culture on landscape preferences	17
	2.5 Individual differences in landscape preferences	19
	2.6 Use of photographs to measure scenic quality	20
	2.7 Post script	21
<b>3.</b>	<b>ACQUIRING THE DATA</b>	
	3.1 Photography of the region	24
	3.2 Landscape Units	26
	3.3 Description of Landscape Units	26
	3.4 Selection of photographs for survey	34
	3.5 South Australian scenes	36
	3.6 Conduct of the survey	36
	3.7 Identification and scoring of landscape factors	44
<b>4.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF DATA</b>	
	4.1 Data set	47
	4.2 Participant numbers and characteristics	47
	4.3 Comparison of participants with South Australian community	48
	4.4 Internet access	50
	4.5 Comments by participants	51
	4.6 Overall ratings by participants	53
	4.7 Scoring of landscape factors	55
	4.8 Influence of seasonal conditions	60
	4.9 Land use ratings	63
	4.10 Landscape unit ratings and predictive models	71
	4.11 Summary	80
<b>5.</b>	<b>MAPPING SCENIC QUALITY</b>	
	5.1 Basis of mapping	82
	5.2 Overall assessment	82
	5.3 Ratings by landscape unit	82
	5.4 Micro scenic quality ratings	98
	5.5 Summary	106
<b>6.</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS</b>	
	6.1 Regional scenic quality ratings	108
	6.2 Application of predictive models	110
	6.3 Application to planning, development and management	116
	6.4 Summary of recommendations	122
<b>7.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	124
	7.1 Project brief and outcomes	124
	7.1 Scenic quality and the community	124
<b>8.</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>	125

---

---

**TABLES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1	Model relating scenic resource values to landscape preference components	11
2.2	Correlation (Pearson) matrix	17
2.3	Comparison of field and laboratory assessments	21
3.1	Summary of photographs	24
3.2	Photographs of key features	34
3.3	Photographs selected of key features	34
3.4	Photographs selected of the Barossa Ranges	34
3.5	Categories for selection of scenes	35
3.6	Main combinations for selection of scenes	35
3.7	Photographs per combination	35
3.8	Photographs per landscape unit	36
4.1	Age distribution of participants	49
4.2	Gender of participants	48
4.3	Educational attainment of participants	49
4.4	Birthplace of participants	49
4.5	Participants' age vs gender	49
4.6	Participants' education vs gender	49
4.7	Participants' birthplace vs gender	49
4.8	Average ratings by participant characteristics	49
4.9	Nature of comments by participants	51
4.10	Number of scenes per landscape factor	56
4.11	Landscape factor equations	57
4.12	Correlation of Factors with Rating	57
4.13	Barossa Ranges scenes	59
4.14	Summary of South Australian cereal scenes	60
4.15	Summary of cropping survey scenes	61
4.16	Comparison of groups of cropping scenes	61
4.17	Summary of cropping survey scenes	61
4.18	Comparison of individual cropping scenes	62
4.19	Revised ratings – cropping scenes	62
4.20	Revised frequency of ratings	62
4.21	Comparison of pasture scenes	63
4.22	Scenes with vines	64
4.23	Pastoral scenes	66
4.24	Topography of pastoral scenes	66
4.25	Cropping scenes	67
4.26	Scenes with Pines	68
4.27	Scenes with rivers & creeks	69
4.28	Scenes with buildings & structures	69
4.29	Mean ratings of buildings	70
4.30	Mean ratings of roads	70
4.31	Barossa region scenic quality models	71
4.32	LU 1 Barossa Valley scenes	73
4.33	LU 1 Barossa Valley model	74
4.34	LU 2 Barossa Ranges Scenes	74
4.35	LU 4 Sandy Creek Scenes	75
4.36	LU 6 Freeling Plains Scenes	75
4.37	LU 7 Gomersal scenes	75
4.38	LU 7 Gomersal model	76
4.39	LU 8 Seppeltsfield scenes	76
4.40	LU 8 Seppeltsfield model	76
4.41	LU 9 North Greenock Scenes	77
4.42	LU 10 Light – Truro Scenes	77

---

---

**TABLES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.43	LU 11 Moculta Scenes	77
4.44	LU12 Collingrove scenes	78
4.45	LU12 Collingrove model	78
4.46	LU14 Eden Valley scenes	79
4.47	LU14 Eden Valley model	79
4.48	Land use mean ratings	81
4.49	Landscape unit mean ratings	81
4.50	Accuracy of Predictive Models for Landscape Units	81
5.1	LU1 Barossa Valley Scenes Ratings & Scores	83
5.2	LU 2 Barossa Ranges Scenes Ratings & Scores	83
5.3	LU 3 & 4 North Para River Scenes Ratings & Scores	83
5.4	LU 5 Sandy Creek Scenes Ratings & Scores	84
5.5	LU 6 Freeling Plains Scenes Ratings & Scores	84
5.6	LU 7 Gomersal Scenes Ratings & Scores	84
5.7	LU 8 Seppeltsfield Scenes Ratings & Scores	84
5.8	LU 9 North Greenock Scenes Ratings & Scores	85
5.9	LU 10 Light – Truro Scenes Ratings & Scores	85
5.10	LU 11 Moculta Scenes Ratings & Scores	85
5.11	LU 12 Collingrove Scenes Ratings & Scores	85
5.12	LU 14 Eden Valley Scenes Ratings & Scores	86
5.13	LU 1 Barossa Valley Scenes	87
5.14	Survey Scenes with Vines	87
5.15	Cropping & Pasture Scenes	87
5.16	LU 2 Barossa Ranges Scenes	88
5.17	Barossa Ranges Scenes	88
5.18	LU 3 & 4 North Para River Scenes	90
5.19	Survey Scenes with Rivers & Creeks	90
5.20	LU 5 Sandy Creek Scenes	91
5.21	Scenes with Native Vegetation	91
5.22	LU 6 Freeling Plains Scenes	91
5.23	LU 7 Gomersal Scenes	92
5.24	LU 7 Scenes with Vines & Cropping	92
5.25	LU 8 Seppeltsfield Scenes	93
5.26	LU 8 Scenes with Vines	93
5.27	LU 9 North Greenock Scenes	93
5.28	Vines on Undulating Land with Significant Trees	94
5.29	LU 10 Light - Truro Scenes	94
5.30	LU 11 Moculta Scenes	95
5.31	LU 12 Collingrove Scenes	96
5.32	Collingrove Scenes	96
5.33	LU 13 Kaiserstuhl Scenes	96
5.34	LU 14 Eden Valley Scenes	97
5.35	Eden Valley Scenes	97
5.36	Summary of Landscape Unit Ratings	97
5.37	Comparison of Derived Ratings & Survey Ratings	98
5.38	Ratings of Eyesores - % change	101
5.39	Barossa & Light Heritage Buildings	101
5.40	Ratings of Heritage Buildings	101
5.41	Ratings of Native Vegetation	102
5.42	Ratings of Roadside Trees	102
5.43	Ratings of Streamside Trees	103
5.44	Ratings of Eyesores	103
6.1	Ratings & Rankings of Landscape Units	108

---

<b>FIGURES</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.1	Project methodology	2
2.1	Effect of viewing times on preferences	15
2.2	Kaplans' predictor variables	16
2.3	Rating of waterscapes by Kaplans' predictor variables	16
2.4	Comparison of Italian and Australian landscape preferences	18
2.5	Preference values for 11 landscapes	18
2.6	Preferences of Australian and American students for jarrah forests	19
2.7	Average ratings by participant characteristics	19
2.8	Preferences vs familiarity	20
2.9	Influence on ratings of familiarity with regions	20
3.1	Advertisement in <i>The Advertiser</i> 25 June 2005	43
3.2	Total Responses to Survey during June-July 2005	43
3.3	Notice Publicising Barossa Survey on State Government Intranet	44
4.1	Histogram of participant means	47
4.2	QQ plot of participant means	48
4.3	Ratings arranged in ascending order	48
4.4	Mean average ratings by participant characteristics	50
4.5	Mean average ratings by participant characteristics – exaggerated scale	50
4.6	Duration of surveys – dial up and broadband	50
4.7	Mean ratings of Barossa scenes	53
4.8	Ratings vs SD of scenes	54
4.9	Histogram of scene means	54
4.10	QQ plot of scene means	54
4.11	Frequency of mean ratings	54
4.12	Factor scores vs scenic quality ratings for factors	56
4.13	Histogram of Naturalness Scores	58
4.14	Naturalness vs Terrain scores	58
4.15	Naturalness vs Tree scores	58
4.16	Naturalness vs Visibility of Barossa Ranges scores	58
4.17	Influence of visibility of Barossa Ranges on ratings	58
4.18	Flat land with vines – influence of Barossa Ranges on ratings	59
4.19	Flat land with bare land – influence of Barossa Ranges on ratings	59
4.20	Vines vs Barossa Ranges	60
4.21	Frequency of revised ratings	63
4.22	Histogram of scenes of vines	65
4.23	Vines vs Terrain	65
4.24	Vines vs Trees	65
4.25	Relationship between Tree Scores & Rating of Vines Scenes	65
4.26	Relationship between Terrain Scores & Rating of Vines Scenes	65
4.27	Histogram of pastoral scenes	66
4.28	Relationship between terrain & rating of pastoral scenes	66
4.29	Relationship between tree scores & rating of pastoral scenes	67
4.30	Relationship between naturalness scores & rating of pastoral scenes	67
4.31	Histogram of cropping scenes	68
4.32	Relationship between terrain scores & rating of cropping scenes	68
4.33	Relationship between tree scores & rating of cropping scenes	68
4.34	Histogram of creek scenes	69
4.35	Histogram of scenes of buildings & structures	69
4.36	Histogram of scenes of roads	70
4.37	Comparison of results from model with ratings – Barossa region	72
4.38	Histogram of differences, Barossa region	72

---

**FIGURES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.39	Histogram of LU1, Barossa Valley	73
4.40	Comparison of Results from LU1 Model with Ratings	74
4.41	Histogram of Differences - LU1 Model	74
4.42	Histogram of LU 2 Barossa Ranges	74
4.43	Histogram of LU 4 Sandy Creek	75
4.44	Histogram of LU 6 Freeling Plains	75
4.45	Histogram of LU 7 Gomersal	75
4.46	Comparison of Results from LU 7 Model with Ratings	76
4.47	Histogram of Differences - LU 7 Model	76
4.48	Histogram of LU 8 Seppeltsfield	76
4.49	Comparison of Results from LU 8 Model with Ratings	77
4.50	Histogram of Differences – LU 8 Model	77
4.51	Histogram of LU 9 North Greenock	77
4.52	Histogram of LU 10 Light – Truro	78
4.53	Histogram of LU 11 Moculta	78
4.54	Histogram of LU 12 Collingrove	78
4.55	Comparison of Results from LU 12 Model with Ratings	78
4.56	Histogram of Differences – LU 12 Model	79
4.57	Histogram of LU 14 Eden Valley	79
4.58	Comparison of Results from LU 14 Model with Ratings	79
4.59	Histogram of Differences – LU 14 Model	80
5.1	Barossa Ranges Panoramas	89
5.2	Histogram of Landscape Unit Ratings	98
5.3	Histogram of Heritage Scenes	101
5.4	Histogram of Native Vegetation Scenes	102
5.5	Histogram of Road Scenes	102
5.6	Histogram of Stream Scenes	103
5.7	Histogram of Scenes with Eyesores	103
6.1	Progressive derivation of the Mean for a Scene	110

---

**MAPS**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	Study Area	5
2	Routes travelled for photography	25
3	Land use and vegetation	27
4	Landscape Units	28
5	Visibility of Barossa Ranges	29
6	Location of survey scenes (120)	37
7	Scenic quality ratings by landscape unit	99
8	Barossa Study Region Scenic Quality Ratings	107
9	Landscape units rankings	109

---

**APPENDIXES**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	Project Brief	130
2	Coverage of Photographic Trips	133
3	List of survey photographs of Barossa Study Region and S.A. photographs	134
4	Barossa Study Region scenes	137
5	South Australian scenes	145
6	Summary of scene ratings and factor scores	146
7	Comments by participants	149

## BAROSSA AND LIGHT REGION LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT STUDY PROJECT SUMMARY

The aim of the project was to “assess the scenic quality of the Barossa Valley Region rural landscapes outside of townships”. It required a “publicly defensible and repeatable valuation of the scenic quality of the landscapes and landmarks of the area, giving a value to every landscape unit.” The outcomes of the project were intended to contribute to the setting of “clear strategic directions for the use of land within the Barossa and Light region.”

The approach to this task involved classifying the region into units of similar characteristics, for these to be photographed and rated by participants, and for the ratings to be applied to areas of the region with similar characteristics.

Following the Introduction, Chapter Two focuses on the nature of landscape aesthetics, covering Australian studies of scenic quality which described the intensive activity in this area in the 1970s led by the South Australia, Victorian and New South Wales branches of the National Trust. This activity largely petered out by the 1980s, probably because of the lack of a credible and reliable assessment methodology at that time. Most of the methods used then and since have been judgement based, relying on the expertise or interest of those rating the landscape.

The failure stemmed largely from basing landscape aesthetics on cognition rather than on affective preferences. The cognitive approach describes and analyses the landscape, the affective preferences approach measures one’s likes and dislikes. They are two separate paradigms and the early studies made the mistake of assuming preferences derived from analysis but this is not the case. The methodology adopted in this project measures the preferences for the landscape and then analyses these preferences with the landscape content through statistical means. This approach enables the analysis to move from describing *what* landscapes are preferred to understanding *why* they are preferred.

Chapter Two then briefly described theories of landscape aesthetics which derive from an evolutionary perspective

that landscape preferences are survival enhancing. It examines the influence of culture on landscape preferences, showing from studies that the similarities in preferences between cultures are greater than the differences. The same principle applies also to individual differences in landscape preferences.

The use of photographs to measure scenic quality is reviewed, it being established that providing the photographs meet certain criteria, that preferences based on photographs will be similar to those obtained from field assessments. Finally the author’s four previous studies of scenic quality in South Australia are summarised.

Chapter Three covers the acquisition of data for the Barossa Landscape Assessment Project. It describes the photography of the region in which 1700 photographs were taken during April and May, 2005. Landscape Units for the Barossa Study Region were then defined; fourteen landscape units were defined by reference to their land form, land cover, land use, water and any other significant features. These landscape units provided a basis for the selection of scenes for the survey. In addition, photographs were selected to represent various key features such as cultural aspects, wineries, farm structures, trees along roads and streams, and industry. Photographs were also selected to represent the Barossa Ranges from varying distances. The survey comprised 120 Barossa scenes plus a further 30 scenes from elsewhere in South Australia to ensure that the ratings reflected a State-wide perspective.

Chapter Three then described the conduct of the survey, through the design of the Internet survey instrument, and its release on 15 June 2005. Participants rated the scenes on a 1 – 10 scale. The survey attracted 2260 participants. This Chapter ends with the identification and scoring of landscape factors, these being elements in the landscape which might assist in understanding why certain landscapes are preferred. The landscape factors identified were the significance in the landscape of trees, vines, water and buildings & structures, the nature of the terrain, the

naturalness of the landscape, and the visibility of the Barossa Ranges. Each was scored on a 1 – 5 scale by up to 20 participants.

Chapter Four describes the analysis of the data obtained from the survey. Only those participants who completed all 150 scenes were included; this comprised a data set of 1210 which provided a confidence interval of 2.81. i.e. at a 95% confidence level, the responses would be +/- 2.8% of the true value. The distribution of participant means and rating means were both statistically normal.

Compared with the South Australian community, the participants were better educated and more middle aged, however these differences did not affect the ratings as the average ratings were similar across all participant characteristics, to within about +/- 0.15 of the mean. Around 63% of participants used broadband and took 18 minutes to complete the survey, and 36% used dial up and took 21 minutes. Slowness in loading the scenes, particularly for dial up, had resulted in many not completing the survey.

Comments on the survey were obtained from only 224 participants out of the 2260, indicating a defect in the survey's recording of comments. The comments covered the photographs and the survey, the Barossa landscape and tourism, and development in the region. A selection of the comments was included in this Chapter.

The overall mean of the ratings was 5.30 with a standard deviation (SD) of 1.01 and the ratings of individual scenes ranged from 2.52 to 7.41. The majority were in the 4.5 – 6.5 range.

Of the landscape factors examined, the influence of naturalness, trees and terrain were strongest and water and the visibility of the Barossa Ranges were lower. The presence of vines and buildings & structures actually had a negative influence on ratings. However, as determined subsequently, churches and ruins attracted higher ratings than farm sheds and winery buildings.

The scores for naturalness and trees factors both correlated highly with the scenic quality ratings. Naturalness also correlated closely

with terrain, trees and the visibility of the Barossa Ranges.

The low influence of the Barossa Ranges was interesting. Further analysis indicated that in close proximity it had a marked influence on ratings. Also its influence for scenes of vines on flat land increased by about 1.5 from distant views to close proximity. However for scenes of bare flat land it had no effect on ratings.

The scenes of cropping land were photographed following a prolonged dry period and through comparison with photographs from other seasons it was determined that their ratings should be increased by 25% to more closely reflect their normal contribution to scenic quality. The ratings of pastoral scenes were not increased because dry grass conditions normally prevailed for half the year.

The ratings per land use are summarised in the table below.

Land use	Mean
Vines	5.33
Pastoral	5.73
- flat	5.57
- sloping or hilly	5.84
Cropping (revised ratings)	4.98
Pines	5.00
Rivers & creeks	6.62
- with water	6.97
- dry	6.39
Buildings & structures	4.84
- sheds	4.34
- winery industry	4.82
- churches	5.65
- ruins	6.09
Roads - with vegetation	6.90
- without vegetation	4.90

Comparison of the scores for vines with those for terrain indicated that vines were located on flat or undulating terrain as no score for terrain exceeded 3. Comparison of the scores for vines with those for trees indicated that the more vines the fewer trees, and vice versa. The ratings of scenes with vines increased with the scores for trees and for terrain.

Ratings of cropping scenes increased with steepness of the terrain and with the significance of the trees.

The ratings of pastoral scenes increased with the terrain, the significance of trees, and

overall, with the apparent naturalness of the scene.

The ratings of watercourses were high and the ratings for creeks with water were about 0.6 higher than dry creeks, reinforcing the importance of water in the landscape.

Ratings of buildings and structures differentiated them by type, industrial structures rating much lower than churches and particularly old ruins.

A surprise finding was that roads with indigenous roadside vegetation rated among the highest of all scenes. The reasons for this are not apparent except that trees are a positive feature and the roads are often lined by large trees.

Predictive models using multiple regression analysis were derived for all 120 scenes and some of the landscape units. The model for the entire region used all seven factors, had a correlation coefficient ( $R^2$ ) of more than 0.5, and was statistically significant. The model was as follows:

$$Y = 2.795 + 0.430 \text{ Natural} + 0.265 \text{ Water} + 0.259 \text{ Trees} + 0.172 \text{ Vines} + 0.106 \text{ Terrain} + 0.076 \text{ Barossa Ranges} - 0.013 \text{ Building}$$

The results of the model were compared with the ratings derived from the survey and around two thirds were within +/- 0.5 of the ratings.

Models were also derived for the following landscape units: Barossa Valley, Gomersal, Seppeltsfield, Collingrove and Eden Valley. The remaining units had too few scenes to enable the development of models.

Ratings for each of the landscape units are shown in the following table.

Landscape Unit	Mean
1. Barossa Valley	5.38
2. Barossa Ranges	6.10
3. North Para River	6.57
4. North Para River valley	6.50
5. Sandy Creek	5.15
6. Freeling Plains	5.01
7. Gomersal	5.17
8. Seppeltfield	5.68
9. North Greenock	5.46
10. Light - Truro	5.47
11. Moculta	4.86
12. Collingrove	5.74

13. Kaiserstuhl	-
14. Eden Valley	5.76

The insights into the landscape quality of the Barossa Study Region provided the basis for mapping its scenic quality.

Chapter Five mapped the scenic rating. It derived mean ratings for each of the fourteen landscape unit based on the scenes present in each landscape unit, equivalent scenes from other landscape units, special analyses of sets of scenes (e.g. scenes with vines), and the predictive models derived.

Ratings were derived which differentiated landscape units by a quarter (i.e. 0.25) ratings. They ranged from 5.0 to 6.5. These compared well with the ratings of scenes derived from the survey.

Overall the northern and western areas are low rating, 5 – 5.25, while the eastern area (Collingrove - Eden Valley) is higher 5.50 – 5.75. The core viticulture areas have generally moderate ratings, 5.50. The higher rated Barossa Ranges overlooks the area with most of the Ranges rating 5.50 to 6.50.

The following table summarises the mean ratings for each landscape unit.

Landscape Unit	Rating
1. Barossa Valley	5.25 – 5.50*
2. Barossa Ranges	5.25 – 6.50
3. North Para River	6.50
4. North Para R. valley	6.50
5. Sandy Creek	5.50
6. Freeling Plains	5.00
7. Gomersal	5.25
8. Seppeltsfield	5.50
9. North Greenock	5.50
10. Light – Truro	5.25
11. Moculta	5.25
12. Collingrove	5.50
13. Kaiserstuhl	5.75
14. Eden Valley	5.75

\* Mainly 5.50

In addition to the landscape unit ratings, scenic quality ratings were derived covering particular landscape features within landscape units which were not represented adequately by the scenes in each unit. The features covered:

- Heritage buildings and structures;
- Significant areas of native vegetation;
- Lengths of trees adjacent to watercourses;
- Roadside trees;

- Eyesores such as sheds, car dumps and winery tanks.

The following ratings for these were derived:

Heritage buildings	6.0
Areas of native vegetation	6.25
Roads with indigenous trees	6.5
Streams with trees	6.5
Eyesores	4.0

The presence of each of these in the Study Region was then assessed and mapped.

Chapter Six covered the applications of the Study's findings and recommendations arising from it.

The regional scenic quality ratings for the Study Region were shown as rankings, from 1 for the highest through to 7 for the lowest, each spaced 0.25 units apart.

The predictive models may be used to determine the scenic rating of scenes in the Study Region and comprehensive guidelines were provided to assist in this.

Recommendations were made relating to the planning, development and management of the Barossa Study Region:

## STRATEGIC MEASURES

### Recommendation 1

***The Barossa and Light Councils and Planning SA adopt as a key strategic objective the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the Barossa Region's landscape character and quality covering all aspects of the Region's planning, development and management.***

Such a policy position is important in defining the position of the authorities with responsibility for the Region.

### Recommendation 2

***Protect the landscape character and quality of the core viticulture area of the Barossa Region from further significant structures and buildings and locate future significant structures and buildings outside of the core viticulture area.***

Increasing pressure to locate major winery developments in the Barossa Valley needs to

be managed carefully so that it does not result in the industrialisation of the region. Suitable locations north of Nuriootpa with good access to the Sturt Highway are available for such developments.

## PLANNING MEASURES

### Recommendation 3

***Ensure the provisions of the Region's Development Plan contribute to and do not detract from the protection, management and enhancement of the region's landscape character and quality.***

It is essential that the provisions of the Development Plan further the protection, management and enhancement of the region's scenic quality and do not, by default or ignorance, result in its degradation.

### Recommendation 4

***Ensure that provisions are included in the Development Plan in respect of new developments to safeguard the character and quality of the Barossa region's landscape.***

The Development Plan needs to ensure that the region's scenic quality is fully considered in respect of the requirements of future developments.

### Recommendation 5

***Appoint a landscape architect to advise councils on planning, development and management issues across the Barossa region.***

In considering new developments and enhancing the landscape of the Barossa, in-house expertise would be invaluable.

### Recommendation 6

***Ensure that the western escarpment of the Barossa Ranges, from near Williamstown to near Stockwell, be given special recognition in the region's Development Plan and that its landscape character and quality be accorded stringent protection.***

The natural backdrop provided to the Barossa Valley by the Barossa Ranges needs to be protected in a similar way that the Hills Face Zone behind Adelaide has been protected.

**Recommendation 7**

***Prepare, in conjunction with industry and the community, a landscape management plan for the Barossa region to identify detailed measures to protect, manage and enhance its landscape character and quality.***

Measures to address eyesores, enhance the appearance of vineyards and winery buildings together with major planting programs should be considered as elements in an overall plan to enhance the region's scenic quality which should be developed with community input and discussion.

**MANAGEMENT MEASURES****Recommendation 8**

***The Barossa and Light Councils work cooperatively with industry, land owners and the community to improve the appearance of properties and encourage the removal of features which degrade scenic quality.***

Features which detract from the Barossa's scenic quality include car dumps, transport depots and quarries. Obviously voluntary measures to improve these should be encouraged but failing these, some form of regulatory measure such as land management agreements under the Development Act may be required.

**Recommendation 9**

***In addressing features which degrade scenic quality, adopt a strategy of removal, relocation and reduction in that order.***

Removal would involve cessation of the eyesore (e.g. dumps), relocation would involve moving it a more suitable location (e.g. truck depot) and reduction means leaving it in its present location but screening it (e.g. quarries).

**Recommendation 10**

***Minimise the visual impact of existing buildings and structures through appropriate means.***

The visual impact can be lessened by tree planting, mounding, trellises and painting a suitable tone.

**Recommendation 11*****Green the Barossa***

The single key action which can achieve region-wide scenic quality enhancement is the planting of trees on a large scale. Trees represent a natural element, so important in achieving high scenic quality. Planting of trees together with shrubs and grasses, and assisting the regeneration of existing trees through temporary fencing, will achieve both biodiversity and scenic quality objectives.

**Recommendation 12**

***Encourage the viticulture and agriculture industries in the Barossa region to utilise professional advice from landscape architects regarding measures to improve the visual appearance of their operations, developments and infrastructure.***

Straight rows of vines can be made more attractive through following the contours of the land. Establishment of shelterbelts, dams, tracks, buildings etc would all benefit from the advice of landscape architects.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The project could not have been carried out without the assistance of the following people to whom I am very appreciative.

The several thousand individuals who participated in the Internet survey and without whom this Project could not have been completed.

### Members of the Steering Committee

Christine Lloyd, Area Manager, Planning SA  
Gavin Burgess, GIS Analyst, Planning SA  
Louis Monteduro, Strategic Planner, The Barossa Council  
Michael Richardson, Project Planner, Light Regional Council

Roy Blight, Chief Executive, Barossa Light Regional Development Board

Gavin Burgess and Peita Green for assistance in mapping and GIS

David Whiterod for preparing and managing the Internet survey

DEH Environment Information for access to the aerial photography collection

Mary Barnes for statistical advice

My family for tolerating my absences on field work and long hours on the computer

